

**RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM (RTP) – Public Comments re: Procedural Guide Draft [Dated March 10, 2006] (5/12/06)**

<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
<b>LAND TENURE</b>	Grants of exactly \$100,000 should be clarified as either required for 20 years of land tenure or 10 years of land tenure.	Member of the Public (local government)	This has been clarified.
<b>ELIGIBLE PROJECTS</b>	<p>(We) believe that it is appropriate, at this time, to review the funding of multiple-use trails on which equestrians, hikers, and bicyclists will be allowed. There have been allegations, mainly coming from CalTrans, that Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) law prohibits Transportation Equity funding on trails if equestrian usage is allowed on those trails.</p> <p>It is our position that equestrians should continue access to California trails and staging areas and we request that the RTP so state.</p>	Member of the Public (non-profit organization)	<p>No change necessary.</p> <p>The RTP is funded under the federal Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU).</p> <p>Under the RTP, equestrian trails are eligible for funding and equestrian trail use is allowed.</p> <p>In the RTP Guide, see definition of “Diversified Use” and Criteria #10.</p>
<b>COMBINATION PROJECTS</b>	There should be an explanation of why combination projects are ineligible since acquisition projects are eligible and development projects are eligible.	Member of the Public (local government)	Combination projects are not allowed to provide for more efficient and effective use of funds and project completion. No change necessary.
<b>MATCH</b>	The Rules Regarding Match section should clearly define the timing of eligible match-funded activities.	Member of the Public (local government)	This has been clarified.

**RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM (RTP) – Public Comments re: Procedural Guide Draft [Dated March 10, 2006] (5/12/06)**

<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
<b>MATCH and NON-CONSTRUCTION COSTS</b>	Since there is a 25% limitation on non-construction costs of the total project that involves match amount, the “How to Calculate Grant Amount and Match Amount Based on the Cost of the Total Project” section should include a formula to assist the applicant in determining this limitation.	Member of the Public (local government)	No change to this section is necessary. The 25% limitation applies to both the grant and the required match. The eligible cost charts now include this information.
<b>SUMMARY OF THE GRANT PROCESS</b> (In regards to Item #2)	To provide additional guidance, it would be helpful if the Applications section on page 11 was referenced.	Member of the Public (local government)	The suggestion has been incorporated.
<b>SUMMARY OF THE GRANT PROCESS</b> (In regards to Item #3)	An explanation of this item is needed to explain whether this review is prior to the actual submission and is generally a “courtesy” review, or if this is in fact, part of the Department review process after submission. If the latter is the case, then this indication to the Applicant that the Application “requires additional information” would mean that there is an opportunity to submit additional information. If so, then the Procedural Guide should include the complete grant review process, timing for submittal of additional information, and final recommendations that the Department will implement. Additionally, the flow chart on pg. 17 should be refined to reflect the complete review process.	Member of the Public (local government)	The suggestion has been incorporated.  The flow chart is meant as an overall summary of the process, not as a detailed checklist of each task that occurs within the process.
<b>SUMMARY OF THE GRANT PROCESS</b> (In regards to Item #6)	An explanation of what type of signature is required should be noted. In this case, it would be by the Authorized Representative, as designation in the resolution.	Member of the Public (local government)	This information was in Item #7 in the March 10, 2006 draft guide. However, Items #6 and #7 have been edited further to clarify the point made.

**RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM (RTP) – Public Comments re: Procedural Guide Draft [Dated March 10, 2006] (5/12/06)**

<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
<b>SUMMARY OF THE GRANT PROCESS</b> (In regards to Item #9)	Nowhere in the Procedural Guide is an established program schedule, project performance schedule, or specifically the time period to obtain a contract. The Procedural Guide should establish a general schedule of review timing, contract execution and project performance time requirements following the enabling and/or implementing legislation. Possibly add this to the section following the flow chart on page 17.	Member of the Public (local government)	No changes made.  The Procedural Guide does not contain timelines because of the high number of factors and variables that affect these timelines.
<b>SUMMARY OF THE GRANT PROCESS</b> (In regards to Item #12)	It would be helpful if a reference to Section IV Contract Process: Site Inspection were included.	Member of the Public (local government)	This suggestion has been incorporated.
<b>STATE APPLICATION PROCESS</b> (Letters of Support)  (In regards to "Submitting Applications")	Will including letters of support from the Legislature or other entities be highly considered or provide additional scoring or value during the application review process? The use of the word "may" suggests that this is not mandatory. It should be clearly stated whether letters of support are mandatory, if they will be considered during the application review, and how they are valued. Additionally, letters of support occasionally are received after the applications are submitted. Indicate if letters of support will be allowed to be submitted after application submittal.	Member of the Public (local government)	The letters of support submittal process has been clarified in addition to the Department's consideration thereof.

**RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM (RTP) – Public Comments re: Procedural Guide Draft [Dated March 10, 2006] (5/12/06)**

<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
<b>STATE APPLICATION PROCESS</b> (CEQA)	A completed California Environmental Quality Act document should be required prior to grant payment instead of prior to grant award.	Member of the Public (local government)	No change necessary. State Public Resources Code 5072.8(c) requires that CEQA be completed at the time of application.
<b>STATE APPLICATION PROCESS</b> (SHPO MOU)	This section should indicate that the MOU does not need to be signed by the State Historic Preservation Officer until the project is recommended for funding. It should be clarified how and who will process the form with the SHPO office since it will be part of the application and an original signature of the Applicant's Authorized Representative will be with the Department.	Member of the Public (local government)	This section has been clarified.
<b>STATE APPLICATION PROCESS</b> (Grant Scope)	Specify if there is a character count or word limit for the Grant Scope section. Should it be limited to the space available, can additional sheets be attached, is there a font size requirement, etc.	Member of the Public (local government)	There is not a character count or word limit for the Grant Scope. The scope statement is limited to only a description of the work to be accomplished with the grant and match. No change necessary.
<b>PROJECT PROPOSAL</b> (Instructions)	The page limitation and formatting should be mentioned again here consistent with what was mentioned in Item #13 of the Application Checklist.	Member of the Public (local government)	This suggestion has been incorporated.

**RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM (RTP) – Public Comments re: Procedural Guide Draft [Dated March 10, 2006] (5/12/06)**

TOPIC	COMMENT	WHO	RESPONSE
<b>PROJECT PROPOSAL</b> Criteria #5	<p>“Demographically diverse populations” should be defined explaining what the Department considers highly desirable and what measures should be used for demographics. For example, some areas serve highly populated areas, while others serve more rural area; some of these same areas include disadvantaged communities as well as wealthy communities; some communities include several ethnicities but not disadvantaged communities; while others serve a variety of population ranges. Again, the demographics that the Department will consider should be clarified.</p> <p>Finally, state if the Department be requiring evidence of demographics such as the Census.</p>	Member of the Public (local government)	<p>Criterion 5 has been removed.</p> <p>The 5 points from Criterion 5 have been distributed among Criterion 3, 4, and 14 (now 13 in the revised guide) as below:</p> <p>Criterion #3 goes up 2 points to a total of 7 points.</p> <p>Criterion #4 goes up 2 points to a total of 7 points.</p> <p>Criterion #14 goes up 1 point to a total of 6 points.</p>
<b>PROJECT PROPOSAL</b> Criteria #6	<p>State if it will be required to demonstrate how the projection of number of user was determined. Including this requirement would add more credibility to the projections and allow the Proposal Reviewers to have more confidence in the projections.</p> <p>Additionally, the scoring criterion provides a maximum score for “high use” although no measure is provided that gives the applicant a benchmark for high use. High use in one community may not be considered high use in another.</p>	Member of the Public (local government)	<p>The Project Proposal instructions encourage applicants to “cite studies, reports or other data that support your responses, where appropriate.”</p> <p>A “benchmark” for high use is not necessary. Project applications will be analyzed in comparison with one another in relation to the size and scope of the project.</p>

**RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM (RTP) – Public Comments re: Procedural Guide Draft [Dated March 10, 2006] (5/12/06)**

<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
<b>PROJECT PROPOSAL</b> Criteria #7	This eligibility requirement should be stated upfront in the Procedural Guidelines under “Eligible Projects” on page 13. This section currently includes notations for compliance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act and appraisal conforming to the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions. The requirement to comply with accessibility laws and rules should also be included on page 13 and/or 14 (Ineligible Projects) to give the applicant the opportunity to determine eligibility before beginning the Project Proposal.	Member of the Public (local government)	This suggestion has been incorporated.
<b>PROJECT PROPOSAL</b> Criteria #8	A statement should be included that indicates responses should be consistent with required Project Location Map as described in item 7 on page 21.  This requirement should also be included in the Project Eligibility section on page 13 and/or Ineligible Projects on page 14, depending on how it’s presented. Again, it gives the applicant the opportunity to determine eligibility before beginning the Project Proposal.	Member of the Public (local government)	This suggestion has been incorporated into Checklist Item #2: Site Plan.
<b>PROJECT PROPOSAL</b> Criteria #12	Clarify if attachments will be allowed demonstrating community meeting, partner meetings, and/or other events, using meeting flyers and announcements, solicitation of comments, meeting sign-in sheets and notes, etc.	Member of the Public (local government)	No change necessary. Attachments are allowed and do not count as part of the 15 pages.

**RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM (RTP) – Public Comments re: Procedural Guide Draft [Dated March 10, 2006] (5/12/06)**

<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
<b>PROJECT PROPOSAL</b> Criteria #13	This requirement should also be included in the Project Eligibility section on page 13 and/or Ineligible Projects on page 14 to give the applicant the opportunity to determine eligibility before beginning the Project Proposal.	Member of the Public (local government)	This suggestion has been incorporated.
<b>PROJECT PROPOSAL</b> Criteria #14	<p>The Management Capacity includes rating structure of “excellent”, “very good”, “good” and “fair.” This type of rating does not provide any type of quantitative value for the applicant to include.</p> <p>It would be more beneficial if each scoring criterion is described in quantitative form, such as:</p> <p>Applicant demonstrates 4-6 integrated trail management process... 5-4</p> <p>Applicant demonstrates 2-4 integrated management processes..... 4-2</p> <p>And so on....This will provide the applicant the ability to prepare a more focused and exceptional proposal regarding Management Capacity.</p>	Member of the Public (local government)	No change necessary. The trail management process elements listed are not a comprehensive list but serve as examples. It is expected that applicants will have a system in place which constitutes a complete integrated management process. Project applications will be analyzed in comparison with one another in relation to the completeness of the trail management process.
<b>PROJECT PROPOSAL</b> Criteria #15	Unless the applicant will be scored on the level of involvement of these service corps with a scoring range as in other proposal items, it should not be necessary for the applicant to describe the involvement of the service corps since they are merely scored on a “yes” or “no”.	Member of the Public (local government)	Clarification has been made.
<b>ELIGIBLE COSTS CHART</b>	A listing of ineligible costs should also be included to make ineligible costs easier to identify. There are limited references to ineligible costs throughout the Procedural Guide, but only incidental to other discussions for that particular section.	Member of the Public (local government)	No change is needed since any costs other than those listed as “eligible” are ineligible.

RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM (RTP) – Public Comments re: Procedural Guide Draft [Dated March 10, 2006] (5/12/06)

TOPIC	COMMENT	WHO	RESPONSE
<b>STATE RECOMMENDATION FOR FUNDING</b>	It should be noted if the applicant that was not recommended for funding will have the opportunity to participate in a briefing with the Department to fully determine why the project did not get selected, where maximum points were not given and how to improve the application for the next funding cycle.	Member of the Public (local government)	This suggestion has been incorporated.
<b>TIP REQUIREMENT</b>	<i>The listing of the Project on either the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) or a local Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), as applicable. <b>Comment:</b> This sentence is not clear. It should be reworded to enable the applicant to fully comprehend this particular requirement. For example, it could be revised as follows: As applicable, the Project should be listed on either the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) or a local Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).</i>	Member of the Public (local government)	The sentence has been clarified.
<b>FEDERAL APPROVAL OF RTP PROJECTS</b>	<i>After the Applicant receives... Once these requirements are met, DPR will submit the Project to FHWA for review and approval, which could take several months.</i>  <b>Comment:</b> The use of the word “several months” does not provide a definitive timeframe for applicants. Below the criteria it states that “DPR recommends that applicants budget accordingly in order to cover any pre-approval costs associated with the Project.” DPR should provide a schedule of review and approval in order for the applicant to budget accordingly as well as dedicate and schedule staff in order to complete the project.	Member of the Public (local government)	No changes made.  The Department is unable to provide a definitive timeframe as to how long the Federal Highway Administration will take to review and approve a project for funding. The Procedural Guide does not contain timelines because of the high number of factors and variables that affect these timelines.



**RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM (RTP) – Public Comments re: Procedural Guide Draft [Dated March 10, 2006] (5/12/06)**

<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
<b>CONTRACT PROVISIONS OVERVIEW</b> (Scope Change)	<i>See page X for...</i> Page 75 should be referenced.	Member of the Public (local government)	This correction has been made.
<b>CONTRACT PROVISIONS OVERVIEW</b> (Loss of Funding)	Same comment as for Summary of Competitive Grant Process above. No where in the Procedural Guide is an established program schedule, project performance schedule, or specifically the time period to obtain a contract. The Procedural Guide should establish a general schedule of review timing, contract execution and project performance time requirements following the enabling and/or implementing legislation.	Member of the Public (local government)	Language has been simplified. The Procedural Guide does not contain timelines because of the high number of factors and variables that affect these timelines.
<b>GRANT CONTRACT</b>	Under Section C, change #13 to #2 in order to remain consistent with sequential numbering.	Member of the Public (local government)	This correction has been made.
<b>GENERAL COMMENT</b>	There are multiple typos throughout the Draft Guidelines.	Member of the Public (local government)	Corrections have been made.
<b>CONTACT INFORMATION</b>	Where is the phone number or website for the public to contact with questions?	Member of the CA RTP Advisory Board	Phone numbers are already located within the draft guide. General website address will be incorporated.
<b>CONTACT INFORMATION</b>	Don't see website for RTP.	Member of the CA RTP Advisory Board	General website address will be incorporated.

**RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM (RTP) – Public Comments re: Procedural Guide Draft [Dated March 10, 2006] (5/12/06)**

<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
<b>FORMS</b>	Make the forms downloadable from the website.	Member of the CA RTP Advisory Board	Once the procedural guide is finalized, the entire guide will be available on the website. The forms will be downloadable.
<b>FORMS</b>	Forms should be available electronically.	Member of the CA RTP Advisory Board	Once the procedural guide is finalized, the entire guide will be available on the website. The forms will be downloadable.
<b>FORMS</b>	Make the forms “add-up” automatically.	Member of the CA RTP Advisory Board	The Department supports the idea and will explore the opportunity to implement it.
<b>COMPLIMENTS</b>	I did read it; I think it’s an excellent guide.	Member of the CA RTP Advisory Board	Comment acknowledged.
<b>COMPLIMENTS</b>	Read guide; excellent job.	Member of the CA RTP Advisory Board	Comment acknowledged.
<b>COMPLIMENTS</b>	Great resource and great effort.	Member of the CA RTP Advisory Board	Comment acknowledged.